

1

2

3

4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

5

6

MARY MOORE, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
ADDUS HEALTHCARE, INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

7

8

9

10

11

Case No. [19-cv-01519-HSG](#)

**ORDER CONCERNING  
EVIDENTIARY SUBMISSION**

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion to remand, the dispositive issue for which is whether CAFA's amount-in-controversy requirement is met. Dkt. No. 17. Ninth Circuit law provides that, as a procedural minimum, both parties should have a "fair opportunity to submit proof" on the subject. *Ibarra v. Manheim Invs., Inc.*, 775 F.3d 1193, 1200 (9th Cir. 2015). Although the Court reads Plaintiffs' papers as suggesting that they are resting on their submissions, *see* Dkt. No. 23 at 4 (contending that "Plaintiffs need not rebut Defendants' conjectures with their own evidence to prevail on their Motion"), in keeping with *Ibarra*'s directive, the Court provides Plaintiffs one week from the date of this order to submit any evidence they wish on the dispositive issue. If Plaintiffs do not intend to submit any such evidence, they should so confirm in a simple filing not to exceed two sentences (with no legal argument) by the deadline.

24

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25

Dated: 7/25/2019



HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
United States District Judge

26

27

28